

had been left out of Claim 7. The foregoing amendment remedies this and now makes Claim 7 complete. This newly-introduced subject matter should not raise any issues that require any further consideration, and it is believed that the application should simply proceed to grant.

It is furthermore noted in the amendment to Claim 7 that one other minor amendment has been made to make the claim more gramatically correct.

The applicant also notes the statement of reasons for allowance made by the examiner. The applicant is not in agreement with those statements. The applicant's position is that in connection with both Claims 1 and 7 it is the overall combination of each of these respective claims that has been instrumental in determining allowability of those claims. For example, with regard to Claim 1, the examiner's statement relating to the first light beam, in the applicant's opinion, does not represent a fair assessment of the reason for allowance. This element alone is not believed to be the sole reason for allowance, but again it is more the overall combination of elements in, not only Claim 1, but also Claim 7 that allowance should be based upon.

September 25, 1990

Entry of this amendment is respectfully requested. Should further questions arise concerning this application, the examiner is invited to call the applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Akira Wade

By 

David M. Driscoll, Reg. 25,075  
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant  
Tel. (617) 720-3500